

REMARKS

Claims 30-53 are currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1-29 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 30-53, all without prejudice. New claims 30-53 introduce no new matter and are supported by the Specification and the original claims. For example, Applicants submit that new claims 30-53 are supported by original claims 1-29, as follows:

New Claim	Original Claim(s)
30	1, 2 and 3
31	4
32	5
33	1 and 6
34	1, 7 and 8
35	9
36	1 and 10
37	11, 14 and 15
38	11, 18, 19 and 20
39	12
40	13
41	16
42	17
43	21
44	22
45	22
46	23
47	24
48	25
49	26
50	27
51	28
52	29
53	29

A complete listing of all claims ever presented is set forth herein in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(c)(1). Moreover, the total number of claims has not increased. After the entry of new claims 30-53, there will be a total of six (6) independent claims in this application. Applicants submit herewith credit card payment for the additional independent claims fees necessitated by the amendments made herein. Entry and consideration of the amendments made herein, in conjunction with the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-23 and 27-28 as being of improper multiple dependent format. Applicants have canceled original claims 1-29 in favor of new claims 30-53. Thus, the Examiner's objection is moot. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 30-53 contain no multiple dependent claims which refer to other claims in anything but alternative format, nor any multiple dependent claims which depend from other multiple dependent claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112:

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement. Additionally, in the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 3-6, 8-23 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As stated above, Applicants have canceled original claims 1-29 in favor of new claims 30-53. Thus, the Examiner's rejections are moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 30-53 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. For example, in the event the Examiner were to apply a similar enablement rejection to new claims 30-53, Applicants respectfully note that new claims 37 and 38 (which are based on original claim 11, and others as noted above) are directed to a smaller scope of polymers than original claim 11, and are fully enabled by the instant Specification. Additionally, the several instances of alleged indefiniteness cited by the Examiner in the Office Action have been addressed in new claims 30-53.

With respect to new claims 37 and 38 (and those dependent there from), Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 37 is directed to polymers with structures (Ia) or (Ib), having a more limited selection of ligands, repeating units and substituents; and that new claim 38 is directed to polymers having repeating units (Ic-1) and (Id-1), and a more limited selection of ligands, repeating units and substituents.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of original claim 11 as encompassing thousands of different polymers does not apply to new claims 37 and 38 or to the claims dependent there from. Furthermore, the Specification as filed provides one of ordinary skill in the art with a clear test procedure for establishing the presence of both fluorescence and phosphorescence and thus distinguishing between phosphorescent and luminescent polymers according to the invention, namely on the basis of their emission spectra (p. 39, 1. 1-12 of the Specification). Typical emission spectra are provided in Figures 1-3 of the Specification. The test and determination are within the ordinary skill level and do not constitute undue experimentation.

In addition, Examples 10-19 of the Specification provide concrete examples of luminescent polymers according to the invention and of their preparation. The white luminescence produced by these luminescent polymers is caused by the combination of fluorescence and phosphorescence. Such additive color mixing of the fluorescence of the conjugated main chain and the phosphorescence of the covalently bonded metal complex or complexes allows the emitted light to appear white as a whole (p. 23, 1. 4-9 of the Specification as filed). Without a combination of fluorescence and phosphorescence, emitted light would appear colored.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that the Specification as filed, with the Examples and the Figures, provides enough information to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-10 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0027263 of Doi, *et al.* ("Doi").

Additionally, the Examiner rejects claims 1-10 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0193532 of Ikehira, *et al.* ("Ikehira").

While not necessarily agreeing with the Examiner as to the anticipation of any of original claims 1-29, Applicants have canceled claims 1-29, and presented new claims 30-53. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejections are moot. In the event the Examiner is inclined to apply similar rejections to new claims 30-53, Applicants respectfully traverse such potential rejections for at least the following reasons.

New claim 30 incorporates the subject matter of original claims 1, 2 and 3, and is directed to a phosphorescent polymer *with a structure of the general formulae C or D*. New claim 33 incorporates the subject matter of original claims 1 and 6, and is directed to a phosphorescent polymer *containing repeating units selected from the general formulae A and B-I-1 to B-I-5 or A and B-II-1 to B-II-4 or having a structure of the general formulae C-1 or C-2*. New claim 34 incorporates the subject matter of original claims 1, 7 and 8, and is directed to a phosphorescent polymer *with a structure of the general formulae C or D*. New claim 36 incorporates the subject matter of original claims 1 and 10, and is directed to a phosphorescent polymer *containing repeating units selected from the general formulae A and B-1-I to 13-1-6 or A and B-II-1 to B-II-4 or having a structure of the general formulae C-1, C-2, C-3, D-1, D-2 or D-3*. New claim 37 is directed to a polymer of the general formulae Ia or Ib, and new claim 38 is directed to a polymer of the general formulae Ic-1 or Id-1.

Doi and Ikehira each fail to specifically disclose, either expressly or implicitly, a polymer according to any of new claims 30-53. Thus, neither Doi or Ikehira anticipates the claimed invention.

Conclusion:

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. Consideration of new claims 30-53, withdrawal of all objections and rejections, and Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DIRK MARSITSKY, et al.

Dated: _____

February 5, 2010

By _____

Aaron R. Ettelman

Registration No.: 42,516

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P.O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302)-888-6435

(302)-658-5614 (Facsimile)

E-mail: aettelman@cblh.com